Memorandum

Date:

July 27, 2010

To:

Office of Inspector General

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Office of Legal Affairs

File No.:

008.A13845.A05397

Subject:

CHAPTER 17, OFFICER SAFETY INSPECTION

This memorandum serves as the Office of Legal Affairs' written response to a June 10, 2010, inspection of the Office of Risk Management (ORM) pursuant to Highway Patrol Guide 22.1, Area Resources Management Guide, Chapter 17, Officer Safety.

The inspection was conducted on ORM prior to its abolishment on July 1, 2010, due to a departmental reorganization. As part of the reorganization, ORM's risk management functions were absorbed by OLA.

The ORM had five uniformed staff members whose records were evaluated during the inspection: four sergeants and one officer. Following the departmental reorganization on July 1, 2010, three of the sergeants and the officer were re-assigned to other commands. As a result, only one uniformed staff member whose records were inspected remains in OLA. Although the general corrective actions listed below will apply to current and future uniformed staff in OLA, the specific corrective actions will apply only to the sergeant in OLA whose records were inspected.

FINDINGS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP:

Finding 1 – Agree. Three of four (75 percent) of the required uniformed staff have not received annual Physical Methods of Arrest (PMA) certification.

The OLA will coordinate training with the Academy Enforcement Tactics Training Unit and ensure the affected uniformed employee fulfills the certification requirements of PMA by September 30, 2010.

Finding 2 – Agree. Currently, there is no consistent means of follow-up to assure timely PMA certification or recertification of officers and sergeants.

The OLA has established a suspense system to ensure timely PMA certification or recertification of uniformed staff.

Office of Inspector General Page 2 July 27, 2010

Finding 3 – Agree. One of four (25 percent) of the uniformed staff is not current on pistol shoots as required for administrative positions.

The OLA will coordinate training with the Academy Weapons Unit (AWU) and ensure the affected uniformed employee becomes current on required pistol shoots as required for administrative positions by November 30, 2010.

Finding 4 – Agree. Two of four (50 percent) of the uniformed staff are not current on shotgun shoots as required for administrative positions.

The OLA will coordinate training with the AWU and ensure the affected uniformed employee becomes current on required shotgun shoots as required for administrative positions by November 30, 2010.

Finding 5 – Agree. Two of four (50 percent) of the uniformed staff are not current on rifle shoots as required for administrative positions.

The OLA will coordinate training with the AWU and ensure the affected uniformed employee becomes current on required rifle shoots as required for administrative positions by November 30, 2010.

Finding 6 – Agree. Four of four (100 percent) of the uniformed staff's weapons are not current with regard to the field strip inspections.

The OLA will coordinate with the AWU and ensure the affected uniformed employee's weapon is inspected by November 30, 2010.

Finding 7 – Agree. Two of ten (20 percent) of uniformed staff's CHP 415, Daily Field Record, forms do not indicate the activity as "training" during weapons training exercises.

The OLA uniformed staff have been instructed to indicate activity as "training" during all training exercises on their CHP 415. This instruction will be reinforced during Area training days and via email.

If you need further information, please contact Lieutenant Richard Desmond of the RMU at (916) 843-3020.

K. A. HUNTER, General Counsel

Commander

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 1 of 8

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Office of Legal	Office of Inspector	17
Affairs	General	
Inspected by: Sqt. J.	Linson, #16483, Officers	Date:
J. Penney, #15457 and V. Gonzalez, #13191		06/10/10

number of the inspection in the Chapt shall be routed to and its due date. T	ter Inspecti his docume	on number. Under "Forward to:" ento ent shall be utilized to document inno	ssary, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapte ter the next level of command where the document ovative practices, suggestions for statewide um may be used if additional space is required.
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command Executive Office Level	d Level	Total hours expended on the inspection:	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required: ☑ Yes ☐ No	Due D	in E. Sanchez Pate: 07/12/10	
Chanter Inenaction: Sevent	oon Off	cor Safaty	

On June 10, 2010, personnel from the Office of Assistant Commissioner Inspector General (ACIG), conducted a self-inspection of the Office of Legal Affairs (OLA), formerly known as the Office of Risk Management (ORM), in accordance with Chapter 17 of Highway Patrol Guide (HPG) 22.1. The inspection consisted of examining training and equipment records of the uniformed staff at OLA. The CHP 453S, Area Management Evaluation Officer Safety, form was utilized while conducting this inspection and is attached to this exceptions document. It is helpful to note that the CHP 453S is written primarily to assess field commands and therefore some of the criteria for Chapter 17 did not apply as OLA performs administrative functions as its primary mission. The following inspectors worked the corresponding hours as indicated below:

Inspector	Number of Hours
Sergeant Jeremy Linson, #16483	2
Officer Jerry Penney, #15457	4
Officer Veronica Gonzalez, #13191	8
Total Hours	14

FINDINGS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP

- 1. Three of four (75 percent) of the required uniformed staff have not received annual Physical Methods of Arrest (PMA) certification.
- 2. Currently, there is no consistent means of follow-up to assure timely PMA certification or recertification of officers and sergeants.
- 3. One of four (25 percent) of the uniformed staff is not current on pistol shoots as required for administrative positions.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 8

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Office of Legal	Office of Inspector	17
Affairs	General	
Inspected by: Sat. J.	Linson, #16483, Officers	Date:
J. Penney, #15457 and V. Gonzalez, #13191		06/10/10

- 4. Two of four (50 percent) of the uniformed staff are not current on shotgun shoots as required for administrative positions.
- 5. Two of four (50 percent) of the uniformed staff are not current on rifle shoots as required for administrative positions.
- 6. Four of four (100 percent) of the uniformed staff's weapons are not current with regard to the field strip inspections.
- 7. Two of ten (20 percent) of uniformed staff's CHP 415, Daily Field Record, forms do not indicate the activity as "training" during weapons training exercises.

Note: Of the uniformed members assessed during the Chapter 17 inspection of OLA, one officer is currently on limited duty status. This officer's information is not reflected in the findings with regard to training, certifications, and firearms.

COMMAND INVOLVEMENT

Objective:

Ascertain the level of command involvement through review of the officer's CHP 100,
 Officer's Evaluation / Activity Summary, and CHP 118, Performance Appraisal-Officer,
 forms as recommend per Chapter 17 of HPG 22.1; as well as attendance or involvement of
 management during officer safety training sessions.

Findings:

None.

Observations:

- While the personnel from OLA are not primarily involved in enforcement activity, the command actively participates and seeks training opportunities which will enhance its personnel's safety.
- OLA uniformed staff diligently attend quarterly decentralized training and annual PMA refresher training.
- Management incorporates elements of officer safety within quarterly staff training days.
- Fifteen of 24 (62 percent) of the CHP 100 forms reviewed did not contain comments on officer safety.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 3 of 8

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Office of Legal	Office of Inspector	17
Affairs	General	
Inspected by: Sgt. J.	Linson, #16483, Officers	Date:
J. Penney, #15457 and V. Gonzalez, #13191		06/10/10

 One of two (50 percent) of the CHP 118 forms reviewed did not contain comments on officer safety.

TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION

Objective:

 Review of the Employee Training Record System (ETRS) as well as hard copy of records to ascertain if training requirements and certification are being maintained for uniformed personnel, as required. Additionally, ascertain if there are follow-up procedures in place to assure timely recertification of all officers and sergeants.

Findings:

- Three of four (75 percent) of the required uniformed staff have not received annual PMA certification.
- Currently, there is no consistent means of follow-up to assure timely PMA recertification of officers and sergeants.

Observations:

- All of the instruction regarding officer safety is provided by the Academy.
- OLA is currently working with the Academy Enforcement Tactics Training Unit to schedule mutually convenient times to have remaining required members of the unit certify in PMA.
- The training records indicate formal PMA refresher training is being received annually.
- OLA has an assigned ETRS data entry office technician and a training supervisor who
 oversees the maintenance of the training program.

SAFETY EQUIPMENT

Objective:

 Assure that all safety equipment is being worn as required by policy, inspected annually, and replaced in a timely manner as necessary. Equipment inspection information is obtained by reviewing ETRS generated CHP 311, Annual Safety / Protective Equipment Inspection, forms.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 4 of 8

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Office of Legal	Office of Inspector	17
Affairs	General	
Inspected by: Sqt. J.	Linson, #16483, Officers	Date:
J. Penney, #15457 and V. Gonzalez, #13191		06/10/10

Findings:

None.

Observations:

- Uniformed personnel at OLA do not typically wear their full duty belt, with Oleoresin Capsicum (OC), while in uniform and working within the office. Policy contained in Highway Patrol Manual 70.6, requires the carrying of the OC when performing enforcement duties. In the event uniformed personnel wear their uniform outside of the building, they wear their full duty belt and OC.
- Inspection of each employee's safety equipment is conducted annually.

FIREARMS

Objective:

Review of the ETRS as well as hard copy of records to ascertain if firearm training
requirements are being maintained and quarterly policy review is being conducted for
uniformed personnel as required. Additionally, determine if weapons training dates
correspond to the activity information entered on employee's CHP 415, Daily Field
Records by utilizing a random grab sample inspection of ten method.

Findings:

- One of four (25 percent) of the uniformed staff is not current on pistol shoots as required for administrative positions.
- Two of four (50 percent) of the uniformed staff are not current on shotgun shoots as required for administrative positions.
- Two of four (50 percent) of the uniformed staff are not current on rifle shoots as required for administrative positions.
- The inspection revealed there were discrepancies with regard to data entry into the ETRS.
 All entries were reflected as qualification shoots. Upon review of the headquarters range 2010 schedule, the majority of shoots were scheduled as alternate shoots.
- Four of four (100 percent) of the uniformed staff's weapons are not current with regard to the field strip inspections.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 5 of 8

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Office of Legal	Office of Inspector	17
Affairs	General	
Inspected by: Sgt. J.	Linson, #16483, Officers	Date:
J. Penney, #15457 and V. Gonzalez, #13191		06/10/10

 Two of ten (20 percent) of uniformed staff's CHP 415, forms do not indicate the activity as "training" during weapons training exercises.

Observations:

- OLA shoots are scheduled and held at the Academy.
- OLA utilizes the Academy range inventory with regard to shotguns, rifles, or any less-thanlethal weapons.
- The Academy range meets all departmental requirements and is maintained by the Academy staff.
- OLA does not maintain any supply of ammunition. All ammunition is acquired from the Academy Weapons Unit.
- The building OLA occupies has one clearing tube that is utilized by its staff when loading and unloading their weapons.
- Once training is conducted, the OLA assigned ETRS data entry office technician updates the employee's training records.
- OLA uniformed staff is current on primary weapon annual full inspections.
- OLA is working with the Academy Weapons Unit to perform the remaining field strip inspections.

PHYSICAL METHODS OF ARREST (PMA)

Objective:

• To ascertain the level of knowledge of PMA related policy and practical application of techniques through first hand observation.

Findings:

None.

Observations:

• Uniformed members of OLA have demonstrated their adequate understanding of Department policy regarding enforcement tactics through observations of the practical application of techniques and discussions of the associated guidelines.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 6 of 8

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Office of Legal	Office of Inspector	17
Affairs	General	
Inspected by: Sqt. J.	Linson, #16483, Officers	Date:
J. Penney, #15457 and V. Gonzalez, #13191		06/10/10

ENFORCEMENT TACTICS

Objective:

 To ascertain the level of knowledge of policy regarding enforcement tactics through discussion with available OLA personnel.

Findings:

None.

Observations:

 Uniformed members of OLA have demonstrated their adequate understanding of Department policy regarding enforcement tactics through discussions of these guidelines and through their diligent attendance of decentralized training where this topic is discussed.

PURSUITS

Objective:

• To evaluate the level of knowledge of policy regarding pursuits through discussion with available OLA personnel.

Findings:

None.

Observations:

 Uniformed members of OLA have demonstrated their adequate understanding of Department policy regarding pursuits through discussions of these guidelines and through their diligent attendance of decentralized training where this topic is discussed.

FORCIBLE STOPS

Objective:

• To evaluate the level of knowledge of policy regarding forcible stops through discussion with available OLA personnel.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 7 of 8

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Office of Legal	Office of Inspector	17
Affairs	General	
Inspected by: Sqt. J	Linson, #16483, Officers	Date:
J. Penney, #15457 and V. Gonzalez, #13191		06/10/10

Findings:

None.

Observations:

 Due to the fact OLA primarily performs administrative duties, personnel have not performed any forcible stops. Uniformed members of OLA have demonstrated their adequate understanding of Department policy regarding forcible stops through discussions of these guidelines and through their diligent attendance of decentralized training where this topic is discussed.

ROADBLOCKS:

Objective:

 To evaluate the level of knowledge of policy regarding roadblocks through discussion with available OLA personnel.

Findings:

None.

Observations:

 Due to the fact OLA primarily performs administrative duties personnel have not performed any roadblocks. Uniformed members of OLA have demonstrated their adequate understanding of Department policy regarding forcible stops through discussions of these guidelines and through their diligent attendance of decentralized training where this topic is discussed.

RADIO FAMILIARIZATION

Objective:

 To evaluate the level of knowledge of policy regarding radio familiarization through discussion with available OLA personnel.

Findings:

None.

Observations:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 8 of 8

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Office of Legal	Office of Inspector	17
Affairs	General	
Inspected by: Sqt. J.	Linson, #16483, Officers	Date:
J. Penney, #15457 and V. Gonzalez, #13191		06/10/10

- Through discussion with uniformed personnel, they have demonstrated their understanding of policy regarding this practice.
- Uniformed personnel demonstrate their ability to utilize radio control heads while changing frequencies to correspond with the areas they are traveling through while driving and performing normal investigative duties.
- OLA uniformed personnel attended the mandated CHP Enhanced Radio System (CHPERS) training and attendance was entered into ETRS.

Commander's Response: Concur or Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)
Please provide response in the form of a CHP 51, Memorandum.
Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)
Required Action
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline
Please provide response in the form of a CHP 51, Memorandum.
Employee would like to discuss this report with COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE DATE
the reviewer.
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.) INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE DATE
111000000000000000000000000000000000000
Reviewer discussed this report with REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE
employee Concur Do not concur
Concar Do not concar

AREA MANAGEMENT EVALUATION OFFICER SAFETY

CHP 453S (Rev. 6-06) OPI 009

AREA	DIVISION	NUMBER
009	005	
EVALUATED BY		DATE
Sergeant Linson, Officers Penney/Gonzalez		06/10/2010

INSTRUCTIONS: Indicate items reviewed by placing a check in the "Evaluated" box and/or the "Action Required" box. If this form is used as a Correction Report, the "Correction" box should be initialed and dated as deficiencies are corrected. Answer individual items with "yes" or "no" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. If additional comments are necessary, the information can be placed on the CHP 454, Area Management Evaluation Supplement. The Supplement should include significant findings, accomplishments or corrective actions, unresolved items, problems or progress, and the evaluator's overall impressions. This form can be completed in pen or pencil, and the Supplement can be handwritten if desired.

	<u>_</u>					
Forma		nformal Evaluation	SUSPENSE DATE			
FOLLOW-UP	REQUIRED No	☐ Correction Report	COMMANDER'S REVIEW	Dut	DATE	18IC
1. COMM	1. COMMAND INVOLVEMENT		Yes Yes	ACTION REQUIRED Yes	CORRECTED	
	pes the command emp	hasize importance of proper enforc rred by officers?	ement tactics to achiev	ve the lowest possible	✓ Yes	□No
(1)	Does the commande	er stress importance of proper enfor	rcement tactics, includi	ng use of force?	✓ Yes	□No
(2)	Does the safety reco	ord of the command reflect an awar	eness of proper tactics	?	✓ Yes	□No
(3)	Do the officers' CHP safety?	100 and CHP 118s, Performance	Appraisals, contain con	nments on officer	∐ Yes	 ✓ No
b. Are the commander and lieutenants knowledgeable of enforcement tactics, physical methods of arrest, proper use of force, and the correct use of safety equipment?			✓ Yes	□No		
(1)	Is this knowledge ap	plied properly in critiques of incider	nts involving officers an	d sergeants?	✓ Yes	□No
(2) Do the captain and lieutenants maintain a minimum level		el of enforcement skills	of enforcement skills?			
	(a) Do they attend o	officer safety training sessions?			✓ Yes	□No
	(b) If they are not in	volved in officer safety, what are th	e reasons?			
			EVALUATED	ACTION REQUIRED	CORRECTED	D
2. TRAIN	ING AND CERTIFICA	ATION	Yes	Yes	OOMALOVE	=
a. Do	training records indica	ate formal training has been receive	ed and certified?		☐ Yes	✓ No
(1)		inual certification of traffic officers a nods of arrest, and the proper use o corded for:				
	(a) Searching techn	iques.			☐ Yes	✓ No
	(b) Handcuffing.				☐ Yes	✓ No
	(c) Use of safety eq	uipment.			☐ Yes	✓ No
	(d) Suspect control.				☐ Yes	✓ No
	(e) High risk and fel	ony stops.			☐ Yes	✓ No
					_	C3.41
	(f) Hostage control.				☐ Yes	✓ No
	(f) Hostage control.(g) Prisoner transpo	rtation.			☐ Yes	✓ No

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL AREA MANAGEMENT EVALUATION

OFFICER SAFETY

_								
	(2)	ls t	he command dedicating enough time toward training?			✓ Yes	□No	
		(a)	Do training records reflect certifications for officers and	sergeants are current?		☐ Yes	☑ No	
		(b)	Is there an established follow-up procedure to assure til and sergeants?	mely recertification of all	officers	☐Yes	☑ No	
b.			a supervisors review CHP 121s, CHP 121As, pursuit inve- general observations to determine if proper enforcement			✓ Yes	□No	
	(1)	Аге	well-handled incidents recorded for future training purpo	oses?		✓ Yes	□No	
	(2)		use of force situations closely reviewed to ascertain if all what level of force, is justified?	l uniformed personnel ur	nderstand when,	✓ Yes	□No	
		(a)	Does an examination of CHP 100, CHP 118s, and citize being made?	en complaints indicate a	through review is	✓ Yes	□No	
		(b)	Do Area supervisors notify those officers who are not pris made available?	roficient and ensure refre	esher training	Yes	□No	
C.	ls r	refres	her training required prior to certification?			✓ Yes	□No	
	(1)	Are	the number of training hours necessary to accomplish or	ertification indicated on t	he CHP 270?	✓ Yes	□No	
		(a)	Is any pattern of training weakness apparent?			✓ Yes	□No	
		(b)	Have necessary remedial steps been taken to assure the categories?	norough and continuous	proficiency in all	☐Yes	✓ No	
d.	Do	es th	e command have an adequate number of instructors?			☐ Yes	☑ No	
	(1)	ls ir	structor proficiency maintained?			☐ Yes	✓ No	
	(2)	Has	an individual been given responsibility for the program?			☐ Yes	✓ No	
		(a)	Does that individual ensure the quality and level of profi	ciency is maintained?		Yes	☑ No	
	(3)	Are	there adequate and properly maintained facilities and ed	uipment available for of	ficer safety training?	✓ Yes	□No	
	(4)	Wha	at is the quality and quantity of the training being given?	All Officer Safety relat	ed hands on training is o	btained vi	a Academy	
		Sta	ff at the Academy. Officer Safety Training/refesher is o	btained annually and en	tered into the ETRS sys	tem immed	liately. The	
		Off	ice of Legal Affairs, formerly known as the Office of Ri	sk Management is work	ing on obtaining annual	al certifications.		
	(5)	Hav	e the supervisor and his/her alternate received proper tra	aining?		☐ Yes	✓ No	
3. SA	AFET	TY EC	QUIPMENT	Yes Yes	ACTION REQUIRED No	CORRECTED	<u> </u>	
a.			esin Capsicum (OC) spray (pepper spray) carried by all u duty, in uniform?	uniformed personnel, cap	otain and below,	☐Yes	✓ No	
	(1)		C spray used when the need is indicated? Are notations is utilized to subdue a subject?	s made оп booking shee	ts when OC spray	✓ Yes	□No	
	(2)		en an officer is assaulted and an injury occurs, are the su spray on the CHP 121?	pervisors noting the use	e/nonuse of OC	✓ Yes	□No	
	(3)		individuals who are exposed to OC spray decontaminate water within 30 minutes?	ed by flushing the affecte	ed area with clear	✓ Yes	□No	

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL AREA MANAGEMENT EVALUATION

OFFICER SAFETY

_	(a) Do Area patrol cars carry at least two 500 mil. bottles of saline solution?	✓ Yes	□No
	(b) Are officers/sergeants familiar with the decontamination and first-aid procedure?	✓ Yes	□No
k	b. Are officers/sergeants familiar with the function of their duty holsters?	✓ Yes	□No
	(1) Can officers/sergeants draw and fire their weapon, re-holster and without looking at the holster, fast the safety strap with one hand?	en ☑ Yes	□No
	(2) Can officers and sergeants draw and fire their weapons within one and a half seconds, using one had	and? ✓ Yes	□No
	(3) Is there personal confirmation by the testing officer that all weapons are unloaded prior to holster- related exercises?	✓ Yes	□No
C	c. Are officers/sergeants proficient in reloading their weapons?	✓ Yes	□No
C	d. Do officers/sergeants routinely practice with their batons?	✓ Yes	□No
	(1) Do officers/sergeants carry their batons on all enforcement stops?		□No
	(2) Can officers/sergeants successfully demonstrate approved baton techniques?	✓ Yes	□No
E	e. Do all uniformed personnel wear body armor?	✓ Yes	□No
	(1) Were required reports submitted to Supply Services Unit, per policy, for any incidents where body armor was struck by a bullet or other penetrating type instrument?	✓ Yes	□No
	(a) If so, did the involved officer receive a complete physical examination?	✓ Yes	□No
f.	f. Are holsters, ammunition, magazines, magazine pouches, handcuffs, handcuff case, and OC spray projectors inspected in conjunction with the annual performance appraisal?	✓ Yes	□No
	(1) Do CHP 311 forms indicate compliance?	✓ Yes	□No
	(2) Were deficiencies corrected within 30 days of the inspection?	✓ Yes	□No
4. F	FIREARMS EVALUATED ACTION REQUIRES Yes Yes	CORRECTE	D
а	a. Has the requirement for quarterly review of policy regulating discharge of firearms been compiled with?	✓ Yes	□No
	(1) Do officers thoroughly understand the policy?	✓ Yes	□ No
	(a) Do incidents involving firearms show proper understanding of the policy?	✓ Yes	□No
b	b. Are shoots conducted as required by policy?	☐ Yes	☑ No
	(1) Have steps been taken to correct training deficiencies?	☐ Yes	✓ No
	(2) Are weapons training and maintenance records readily available? Current?	✓ Yes	□No
	(3) Do training records show qualification with all authorized weapons, day/night shoots, etc.?	☐ Yes	☑ No
С	c. Does the Area have a range officer?	☐ Yes	☑ No
	(1) Has the officer completed Academy training for range officers?	☐ Yes	✓ No
	(2) Does the officer supervise all shoots?	☐ Yes	☑ No
	(3) Is the officer well-organized in his/her training?	☐ Yes	✓ No
	(4) Is there a designated alternate to the range officer?	☐ Yes	☑ No
	(a) Has that officer received Academy training?	☐ Yes	✓ No

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

AREA MANAGEMENT EVALUATION OFFICER SAFETY

	4. 1000 (1.tev. 5 co) 6. 1 500		
	d. Are range facilities adequate for pistol, rifle, shotgun and night shoots?	√ Yes	□No
	(1) If not, has alternate training been established and plans developed to obtain adequate facilit	ties?	□No
	(a) Do plans follow instructions for range contract renegotiations?	☐ Yes	□No
	(b) Have future range needs been considered?	☐Yes	□No
	e. Is an effective and efficient inventory process for shotguns, rifles, and ammunition in place?	√ Yes	□No
	(1) Have shotguns been inventoried as required?	✓ Yes	□No
	(a) Are all shotguns accounted for?	✓ Yes	□No
	(b) Is maintenance/cleaning done as required?	✓ Yes	□No
	(c) Are shotguns fired annually to ensure operable condition?	✓ Yes	□No
	(2) Have tactical rifles been inventoried as required?	✓ Yes	□No
	(a) Are all tactical rifles accounted for?	✓ Yes	□No
	(b) Is maintenance/cleaning done as required?	✓ Yes	□No
	(c) Is there adequate storage when the weapons are not being carried by on-duty officers?	✓ Yes	□ No
	(d) Is there an effective method for assignment and control?	✓ Yes	□No
	(3) Is there a procedure in place to periodically audit ammunition? Are the following steps in the process taken?	e audit ☑ Yes	□No
	(a) Beginning inventory determined?	✓ Yes	□No
	(b) Has the total amount of ammunition ordered by requisition as well as returned (unused) been determined?) ammunition ☑ Yes	□No
	(c) Has the total rounds issued per ammunition records been determined?	✓ Yes	□No
	(d) Has a physical inventory of ammunition been taken?	✓ Yes	□No
	(e) Has the physical count been compared to the balance on hand according to the invento	ory record?	□No
	(f) Have rounds issued per training records been compared to rounds fired per shooting rounds	sters?	□No
	(g) Has the mathematical accuracy of the inventory records been tested?	✓ Yes	□No
	(h) When ammunition orders are received from Supply Services Unit, is the merchandise in quantities checked against the packing/shipping documents, exceptions noted, and received from Supply Services.		□No
	acknowledged immediately upon delivery?		□ No
ſ.	f. Is policy adhered to requiring firearms not to be drawn, loaded, or unloaded except in the clearing		
	(1) Does location of the clearing tube(s) provide safety to personnel in or about the office in the accidental discharge?	event of an ✓ Yes	□No
g	g. Are weapons training records maintained as required per policy? Has record reliability been det by testing the accuracy of the following recorded information?	ermined ✓ Yes	□No
	(1) Do the dates recorded on the various records correspond to the actual date training was cor	nducted?	□No
	(2) Do training dates correspond to the activity information on the employee's CHP 415?	☐ Yes	✓ No

AREA MANAGEMENT EVALUATION

OFFICER SAFETY

CFIF 455	5 (Rev. 6-06) OPI 009				
(3) Do training dates closely correspond to the dates ammunition records)?	on was issued for trainin	g (per inventory	✓ Yes	□No
(4	(4) Was ammunition issued for training (per inventory records) compared with the actual amount expended (per the shooting roster)?				
	(a) Once done, was the disposition of any unused ammuni	tion verified for those tra	nining days tested?	✓ Yes	□No
(5) Are records kept updated as training takes place?			✓ Yes	□No
(6) Is training recorded on the employee's CHP 270 and in ETF	✓ Yes	□No		
(7) Is required information recorded in accordance with establis	☐Yes	☑ No		
(8) Is a roster maintained for each shoot which includes all pert date, etc.)?	inent information (type o	of shoot, scores,	✓ Yes	□No
	there a procedure in place which ensures the person process volved with the receiving and recording of ammunition invento		isition is not	✓ Yes	□No
(1	Is a similar procedure in place which ensures the person re- involved with handling and recording ammunition?	cording weapons trainin	g information is not	✓ Yes	□No
(2	Is access to the ammunition storage and inventory records supervisor or backup employee?	limited to the ammunitio	n officer and	✓ Yes	□No
i. If a	Area has a resident post (RP), what procedures are used to en	sure weapons training o	of RP officers? The Officers?	ce of Legal	l Affairs
((DLA), formerly known as the Office of Risk Management (OF	RM), does not have a re	sident post at this time a	nd one is n	ot anticipated.
(1	If RP handles ammunition, are proper accountability proced	ures in place?		✓ Yes	□No
ј. Аг	e required inspections conducted in conjunction with the annua	al CHP 118?		✓ Yes	□No
(1	(1) Is a second inspection of the primary firearm conducted every six months?				✓ No
5. PHYS	ICAL METHODS OF ARREST	Yes Yes	No No	CORRECTE	
a. D	o officers practice weaponless defense?			✓ Yes	□ No
(1	Are officers familiar with the opponent's five weakest points	?		✓ Yes	□No
(2	Have officers with previous assault injuries thoroughly famil	iarized themselves with	weaponless defense?	✓ Yes	□No
b. W	ere demonstrations of the following control techniques by offic	ers observed:			
(1	Control holds.			✓ Yes	□No
(2	Punches.			✓ Yes	□No
(3	Strikes.			✓ Yes	□No
(4	Blocks.			✓ Yes	□No
(5	Defensive kicks.			✓ Yes	□No
(6	Defenses against grabs.			✓ Yes	□No
(7	Defenses against weapons.			✓ Yes	□No
(8)	Ground defense and takedowns.			✓ Yes	□No
(9	Placing and removing suspects into and from vehicles.			✓ Yes	□No

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL AREA MANAGEMENT EVALUATION

OFFICER SAFETY

	- 4000 (Nev. 0-00) OFI 009				
(c. Were observations of practical handcuffing	techniques made?		✓ Yes	□No
	(1) Can officers successfully apply handcu uncooperative?	iffs to a suspect who is standing, kneeling	, prone, or	√ Yes	□No
	(2) Are all uniformed personnel knowledge	eable of departmental policy on handcuffir	ıg?	✓ Yes	□No
c	d. Are all persons subjected to physical arrest	searched for offensive weapons?		✓ Yes	□No
	(1) Has the local jail's experience with CHF	arrests been reviewed?		☐ Yes	☑ No
	(2) Has a practical demonstration of prelim	ninary frisks and thorough searches been	observed?	✓ Yes	□No
	(3) Do all officers know guidelines pertaining	ng to searches of the opposite sex as outl	lined in policy?	✓ Yes	□No
3. E	ENFORCEMENT TACTICS EVALUATED ACTION REQUIREMENT TACTICS			CORRECTED	
a	a. Do sergeants and officers have knowledge of the five options of an enforcement stop?	of proper procedures which should be foll	lowed during each	✓ Yes	□No
b	 Do officers have a constant awareness of the apprehending suspected or known criminals 		tops and when	✓ Yes	□No
	(1) Were demonstrations of an enforcement the situation at all times regardless of the	nt stop observed which show the officers' ne level of hazard presented?	ability to safely control	✓ Yes	□No
	(a) Is the violator stop effectively made	9?		✓ Yes	□No
	(b) Is the violator completely controlled	±?		✓ Yes	□No
	(c) Is the prisoner properly prepared for	or transportation?		✓ Yes	□No
С	. Is there evidence of pre-planning and coordi situations?	ination with allied agencies to prepare be	at officers for hostage	✓ Yes	□No
	(1) Do officers understand their role is limite having jurisdiction?	ed to containment of the incident until reli	eved by the authority	✓ Yes	□No
	(2) Are officers aware of the need to mainta	ain fire discipline at all times?			□No
	(3) Are officers knowledgeable of their resp egress to the scene, evacuate the area	onsibility to detain potential witnesses, co if required, and render necessary medica		✓ Yes	□No
	(4) Were various officers and supervisors q hostage incidents?	uestioned to determine their knowledge of	of the CHP role in	✓ Yes	□No
	URSUITS	Yes EVALUATED	ACTION REQUIRED	CORRECTED)
. P					
	. Are all uniformed personnel well-versed in p	olicy regarding the conduct of pursuits?		✓ Yes	□No
	. Are all uniformed personnel well-versed in p (1) Number of units?	olicy regarding the conduct of pursuits?		✓ Yes ✓ Yes	□ No
		olicy regarding the conduct of pursuits?			
	(1) Number of units?(2) When to discontinue?	olicy regarding the conduct of pursuits?	nent guidelines	✓ Yes	□No
	(1) Number of units?(2) When to discontinue?(3) Were pursuit critiques checked to determ	mine if the pursuits comply with enforcem	ent guidelines	✓ Yes	□ No

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

AREA MANAGEMENT EVALUATION

OFFICER SAFETY

CHP 453S (Rev. 6-06) OPI 009

	(1) Are any written agreements on file?					□No
	(2) Is Division involved in the	planning process?			✓ Yes	□No
	(3) Does the Area have and use a pursuit training guide tailored to the specific needs of the command?					□No
8. F	ORCIBLE STOPS		Yes EVALUATED	ACTION REQUIRED No	CORRECTED	
a	a. Are Area personnel knowledg	eable regarding the policy	on forcible stops?		✓ Yes	□No
	(1) Does the Area follow departmental policy?					□No
	(2) Have forcible stop reports been reviewed for compliance with policy?				✓ Yes	□No
	(a) If forcible stop policy conducted?	has not been complied wi	th, has corrective action be	en taken or training	✓ Yes	□No
9. F	ROADBLOCKS EVALUATED ACTION REQUIRED NO					W
а	a. Has the Area worked with allie of the hollow spike strip?	ed agencies to develop pla	ns for establishing roadblo	cks and deployment	✓ Yes	□No
	(1) Are strategic points and p	personnel assignments out	lined?		✓ Yes	□No
	(2) Have the officers receive	d instructions on the prope	r methods of establishing r	oadblocks?	✓ Yes	□No
	(3) Have interagency training	sessions been conducted	?		✓ Yes	□No
10.	RADIO FAMILIARIZATION		Yes Yes	No No	CORRECTED	
а	a. Are officers familiar with all as	pects of the radio control I	nead?		✓ Yes	□No
b	can officers demonstrate how	to change the radio from	their home Area to anothe	Area/Division?	✓ Yes	□No
С	c. Can officers efficiently operate	all emergency equipmen	from the radio head?		✓ Yes	□No
a	Are officers familiar with all as Can officers demonstrate how	to change the radio from	Yes nead? their home Area to another	No	✓ Yes ✓ Yes	□ No

*Note: Offices assigned to the Office of the Assistant Commissioner, Inspector General (ACIG), function in an administrative capacity. For this reason, the Office of Legal Affairs (OLA), formerly known as the Office of Risk Management (ORM), will not be conducting the second quarter Collisions, Enforcement and Services mandatory inspection. The Chapter 17, Officer Safety, self-inspection will be conducted by the designated ACIG inspection team for the first quarter of 2010.

· \$4				
ž g				
			æ	
	ži			
8				
	4)			
		2		
	¥			